

**REMARKS**

The Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 1, 4-8, and 10-15 remain pending.

The Examiner objected to claims 1, 4-8, and 10-15 for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. These claims have been amended to address the Examiner's concerns.

Claims 1, 4, 8, and 12 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Badamo, et al., US 2002/0181476 (Badamo) in view of Pham, et al., US 7,283,538 (Pham). The Applicants traverse as follows.

Badamo is cited as teaching a basic structure and method for transmitting packets. As set forth in the Office Action, however, Badamo fails to teach the claimed statistic information collecting processor including means for analyzing header information imparted to packets, and means for counting an amount of packets to be transmitted or received through line card interfaces, wherein the statistic information collecting processor predicts the amount of packets to be received by the interfaces from the header information and the amount of packets which have been analyzed, and wherein on the basis of the predicted amount of packets received by all of the line cards, an extension function processor to which the packets are transmitted is selected and implements processing on the packets so as to allocate to each extension function processor uniformly an amount of traffic that is processed in each extension function processor.

Pham is cited as providing these teachings missing from Badamo. Pham, however, does not disclose these features, as discussed more fully below.

The Office Action states that Pham's control processor 84 or crypto processors 86 correspond to the claimed statistic information collecting processor. However, the claimed statistic information collecting processor analyzes header information, counts the amount of packets to be transmitted or received, and predicts the amount of packets to be received from the header information and the amount of packets. Pham does not disclose, particularly in column 13, line 61 through column 14, line 4 (asserted in the Office Action), and function for the control processor 84, and the crypto processors 86 are disclosed simply to perform "current processing". Reference to the entire specification shows that neither the control processor 84 nor the crypto processors 86 perform any of these functions, and thus neither corresponds to the claimed statistic information collecting processor in any relevant way.

Nevertheless, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the statistic information collecting processor analyzes the header information imparted to said packets for each flow, counts the amount of packets for each flow, and predicts the amount of packets for each flow from the header information and amount of packets for each flow. Further, on the basis of the predicted amount of packets for each flow received by all of the line cards, an extension function processor to which the packets for each flow are transmitted is selected from the extension function processors and implements processing on the packets so as to allocate to each extension function processor uniformly an amount of traffic that is processed in each extension function processor. Pham, and thus the combination of Badamo and Pham, discloses that the apparatus measures the load of a crypto processor, and if the load of the crypto processor exceeds an upper limit, changes the status of the

crypto processor to "busy" to process the packets with another crypto processor. Pham, therefore, does not teach or fairly suggest that load distribution is made with respect to header analysis, packet counting, and amount of packet prediction, for each flow to be transmitted or received through line card interfaces. Further no extension function processor is selected based on the predicted amount of packets for each flow.

Independent method claim 12 can be distinguished similarly. Furthermore, although claims 5 and 10-11 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Badamo in view of Pham and Fukumoto, et al., US 2003/0-12139, and claims 6-7 and 13-15 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Badamo in view of Pham and Shiota, US 6,987,762, each of these dependent claims inherits the patentable features of the independent claim from which it is derived. Therefore, for brevity and without admission or prejudice, the separate patentability of these claims will not be discussed at this time.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

To the extent necessary, the Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Brundidge & Stanger, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-4888 (referencing attorney docket no. H-1100).

Respectfully submitted,

BRUNDIDGE & STANGER, P.C.

/Daniel J. Stanger/

Daniel J. Stanger  
Registration No. 32,846

DJS/sdb  
(703) 684-1470